

IMAGINE SOMETHING DIFFERENT: HOW A GROUP APPROACH TO SCHOLARLY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CAN TURN JOY-STEALING COMPETITION INTO SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY

KATHLEEN T. HEINRICH, RN, PhD, FAAN*

As academic institutions across the country raise the scholarly bar for retention, promotion, and tenure, academic leaders are being asked to scholar-ready nursing faculty. With the retirement of senior scholars and too few scholar-mentors to go around, leaders often find themselves squeezed between scholarly expectations on the rise and faculty groups less than ready to meet those expectations. Today's nursing faculty present a formidable scholarly development challenge. A diverse mix of master's-prepared clinicians and recent graduates from doctor of philosophy and doctor of nursing practice programs, they come with a broad range of scholarly learning needs. These inequities not only leave many faculty feeling like scholar-impostors but also they can breed competitions that erode collegial bonds and sow the seeds of incivilities that steal scholarly joy, slow scholarly progress, and stress academic workplaces. What if leaders began imagining something different for themselves and with faculty groups? This is what can happen when leaders expand their perspective on scholarly faculty development from individual challenge to collective responsibility. More essay than research paper, this article describes how scholarly joy-stealing patterns can infiltrate faculty groups, shares thought leaders' visions for supportive scholarly communities, and offers strategies leaders can use to invite faculty groups to co-create cultures of scholarly caring. (Index words: Scholarly incivility; Leadership development; Faculty development; Scholarly faculty development; Scholarly partnerships; Culture of scholarly caring) *J Prof Nurs* 0:1–7, 2016. © 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Put down the weight of your aloneness and enter into conversation.

[Whyte, 2016]

IF SCHOLAR-READYING nursing faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure is one of your greatest challenges as an academic leader, you are not alone. In recent interviews, one dean spoke of her vision for a future in which nursing faculty engage in scholarship because they love it and not because they have to. Yet, she

spends far too much of her time dealing with resistance from “nay-sayers” who do not want to do scholarship—or do not know how—and have to (Heinrich, 2015b).

Nay-saying is but one of the many ways in which educators steal each other's scholarly joy. In an earlier article, I defined *scholarly joy-stealing* as incivility with a scholarly twist (Heinrich, 2017). These joy-stealing interactions rob nurse educators of scholarly productivity along with their zest, clarity, feelings of worth, and desire for more connection (Heinrich, 2007). Aside from their deadening effect on individuals and on faculty groups, scholarly joy-stealing is a sign of deeper problems within nursing education.

Current research confirms the lack of a well-established culture of scholar mentoring (Turnbull & Roberts, 2010), the rarity of effective mentoring for novice faculty scholars

Scholarly Development Consultant, KTH Consulting, Guilford, CT, 06437.

Address correspondence to Dr. Heinrich: Scholarly Development Consultant, KTH Consulting, 18 Meriden Street, Guilford, CT, 06437. E-mail: drkth@att.net 8755-7223

(Chung & Kowalski, 2012; Lehna, Hermanns, Monsivais, & Engebretson, 2015), and the paucity of supportive work environments and strong academic leadership in fostering scholarly productivity (Brady, 2013; Turnbull, 2008). Each of these problems is examined in light of observations from my research, my experiences as a scholarly consultant, and insights from the extant literature.

With regard to the lack of scholar-mentoring cultures in nursing education, one need only contrast our well-orchestrated approach for developing clinicians from novice to expert with the absence of a systematic socialization process for preparing nurse scholars to understand the dearth of such cultures in nursing education (Benner, Sutphen, Leonard, & Day, 2010). In 25 years of studying how nurses become scholars, I have heard more stories about scholarly initiations that were “botched or left incomplete” (Estes, 1992) than not. Taken together, these stories help explain why so many nurses report feeling like impostors when it comes to scholarship (Heinrich, 2013; Peternej-Taylor, 2011). Without a set of shared scholarly practices, values, and norms to pass on, how are we to enculturate the nurse scholars of tomorrow?

As to the rarity of effective scholar mentoring for faculty, my research suggested that many of them hunger after scholar-mentors who never materialize (Heinrich, 2005). Experts agree that scholar mentoring in nursing education is more rhetoric than reality (Dunham-Taylor, Lynn, Moore, McDaniel, & Walker, 2008; Nick et al., 2012; Turnbull & Roberts, 2005; Turnbull & Roberts, 2010). A confluence of factors account for our “seed corn problem” (Moore, 2016) of having too few scholar-mentors to prepare future scholars. The global nursing faculty shortage (Nardi & Gyurko, 2013) is exacerbating twin shortages of scholar-mentors and faculty scholars. With advanced degree programs no longer expected to produce scholar-ready graduates (Clark, Alcalá-Van Houten, & Perea-Ryan, 2010), the number of educationally prepared, faculty scholars is dwindling (McDermaid, Peters, Jackson, & Daly, 2012). Despite this decline and even as responsibility for scholar-readying faculty falls to academic workplaces, none of the seasoned scholars I interviewed had formal preparation for scholar-mentoring faculty colleagues, a role that, regardless of the obvious need, is neither recognized, reimbursed, nor rewarded in many academic institutions (Heinrich, 2015a).

The paucity of supportive academic work environments and strong leadership in regard to scholarship deserves to be discussed separately. Less than supportive work environments can be traced back to our adapting academe's competitive approach toward scholarly advancement rather than developing one more in keeping with nursing's caring and collaborative tradition. Scholarly competition is not only heightening disrespect and coarsening the interactions between and among faculty and leaders (Heinrich, 2014) but also faculty attrition has been linked to nonsupportive relationships and noncaring work environments that spawn uncivil interactions, scholarly and otherwise (Clark, 2013a, b; Clark, Olender, Kenski, & Cardoni, 2013; Dunham-Taylor et al., 2008; Glass, 2007).

A dearth of strong academic leadership around scholarly faculty development reflects upon leaders' relationship to their own scholarship, not to mention their lack of formal preparation. During my interviews with leaders, one pointed out how few deans, directors, or chairpersons are active scholars and how many jettison their own scholarship to assume administrative positions. When asked about their own scholarly origin stories, some leaders spoke of warm relationships with scholar-mentors, whereas others had never been scholar mentored. None had formal “scholar-mentor training,” and none had been tutored in developing faculty groups as scholars (Heinrich, 2015b).

This may explain why many leaders, despite The Code of Ethics (American Nurses Association, 2015) call to foster organizational climates that support scholarly inquiry and a burgeoning literature describing group approaches to scholarly faculty development (Heinrich & Oberleitner, 2012), continue to regard scholarly development as an individual challenge rather than as a collective responsibility. Arguably, this individualistic perspective makes meeting the divergent scholarly learning needs of today's faculty groups even more daunting. I find that leaders who operate out of an individualistic perspective often miss, minimize, or mislabel the relational turbulence unleashed when faculty groups compete for scholarly rewards without a code of etiquette (Heinrich, 2016) to make it safe.

Despite these problems, the leaders I speak with remain optimistic about nursing's scholarly future (Heinrich, 2010a). They venerate scholarship, count scholarly pursuits as one of life's greatest joys, and are sincere in wanting faculty to experience these joys for themselves. They are just not sure how best to transmit this joyous view of scholarship to faculty or how to mitigate the ruinous effects of joy stealing on scholarly productivity.

What would happen if leaders imagined something different for themselves and with their faculty groups? Imagining something different would require that leaders look beyond the development of individual scholars to partner with faculty groups on turning scholarly joy stealing into mutual respect, collaboration, and productivity. As one of the leaders I interviewed put it, we can transform “scholarly hazing” in our generation by transforming “subversive” cultures into ones where “... faculty tell each other the truth and have open conflict while still being successful scholars” (Heinrich, 2015b).

After a brief background that recounts how joy stealing figured into my scholarly origin story, this article describes how scholarly joy stealing subverts faculty cultures, shares futurists' visions for supportive scholarly communities, and offers strategies for leaders who want to partner with faculty on co-creating cultures of scholarly caring.

Background: My Scholarly Origin Story

Long before I heard of scholarly joy stealing, it upended my academic life. As someone who loved to write, I had

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5570556>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5570556>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)